

MEATY EXTRACTS

From Letters Received Criticizing
Castle's Department.

BIG CHIEF JOHNSON'S ASSISTANT

A Chip Off the Same Block—The Brutal
Treatment of Female Employees—Touch-
ing Scandal Matters. The Globe Has
a Few Words of Explanation, and Offers
Them Just Here.

Not less than a dozen communica-
tions reached us the past week con-
cerning Sixth Auditor Castle's Depart-
ment and exclusively confined to Big
Chief Johnson's division.

The following are only a few of the
many extracts we would like to insert,
but want of space prevents us giving
this division more attention at this
time.

The first is from a lady clerk. She
says:

"TO EDITOR OF THE SUNDAY GLOBE:

"Accept the thanks of many clerks
who read your paper and explain. The
Globe is fearless, but it is because
it tells the truth, but your correspond-
ent of the A. and C. division is not on
the eighth floor surely, or else he would
tell how the clerks are treated by John-
son and his assistant chief, Northcutt
(since when can a chief have an as-
sistant?) this is the only division al-
lowed same. I don't think the latter is
human; at least he ought not to be
allowed to domineer over ladies or clerks.
His way of treatment is vile.
At seven, sometimes ten minutes of
9 A. M. he stands with his watch in
hand waiting for 9 o'clock, and we be-
come the one who is not working then.
When a lady leaves her desk he takes
his watch and times her, how long it
takes to go into dressing room these
hot days, with the thermometer at
seventy degrees, as early as 10 A. M.
Old women who have been in office 20
years are treated with such discourtesy
that if that N— were not a cripple
he would have been struck on several
occasions. What right has Johnson to
pupies around? He has no business
or laborer who is put in charge to re-
port, and he does his duty faithfully,
only he never reports foxes when they
go out in the morning and make tea or
in the evening when they change
walts. Johnson and Northcutt have
ruined the life of the clerks long
enough, and the Secretary of Treas-
ury Department ought to make a
change. Johnson treats his friends of
seventh floor quite different. Why? I
could tell so much of the partiality
shown by this monster."

This is also from a lady:

"Where is the humane association?
Get them to come to Auditor for Post-
office, where a man is employed who
swings around on a pair of crutches,
called captain; where he gets the title
from is not known, unless it is because
he is over a set of ladies and drives
them like mules. He looks more like a
— than anything else. He has no
work to do; has two to wait on him.
Then he expects the poor women not to
get up out of their seats unless by his
permission. If he gets anyone out
of their seat he calls them up like they
were dogs. He had one spy employed
who were one of Mahoney's eye
shades.

How did Captain W— lose his
pearl? Auditor Rittman turned her
into a diamond. Poor, blind mother.
Better have an eye on the Maryland
widow. Would not read your paper
because it is too low, beneath her no-
tice; that was her remark to one of
her fellow clerks. I am glad she is
getting so particular. The captain of
the Spanish War brought his wife and
children here. He is a good man, and
deserves credit for bringing his fam-
ily. Why don't the chief bring his
wife? No; she must work. Can not
afford to stay here. Will the New
York widow, whose father is connected
with the railroad, furnish him tickets
to go to G. A. R. encampment, or out
he travel on his army record? I could
give you a great deal more, but will try
and come to your office some time next
week."

Some of the foregoing is too obscure
for us to comprehend exactly, but the
latter portions are so plain and so
strongly of scandal. The Globe want
anything and everything but scandal,
and hence the letter is cut off where it
began to develop this tendency. Scand-
als, of course, that are of such a pub-
lic character as to bring criticism upon
the decent women in the Department
will be aired by The Globe to the end
that the virtuous may be protected.
Scandals, however, for scandal sake,
and which cater to the vicious and
lecherous-minded, salaciously retailed,
are barred in these columns.

Two special delivery letters reached
us late Saturday night, containing
notice of warning of Johnson's attempt
to impose upon The Globe and to be on
the lookout for "dummy" articles
which he would have written and mailed
The Globe to catch it napping.

Passing, for the present, from John-
son & Castle's Department to notice a
letter from a lady in the Pension Of-
fice, the same answer will apply to her
communication. It details the suspi-
cious intimacy of a lady in the re-
cord division with a married clerk, and
their love-making, which is sickening,
she says. Also a lady (on the shady
side of 50, with tiffin locks," gets a
rap, as does "a lantern-jawed grass
widow." This is all very wrong on the
part of our correspondent. Suspicious
must not be tortured and girls, and
aired in a public journal. Nothing but
conduct which reflects on the discip-
line of the Department, the disrespect-
ful behavior of chiefs, and the immor-
al or immoral actions of male and fe-
male clerks, where such exhibitions
scandalize the sensible and virtuous,
are proper subjects for newspaper criti-
cism. In such cases as these The
Globe will be fearless, if not merciless,
but it positively will not go into the
business of innuendo, slander and blas-
phemous character on the mere suspicion
of anybody, man or woman, in the De-
partments, or outside of them.

As to Mr. Castle's Department in
general, and Johnson's division in par-
ticular, The Globe is being overwhelmed
with communications but few facts.
Wading through a mass of these to se-
lect a specific fact here and there is
wearisome, especially when facts are
so easy to obtain and takes such few
words in the telling. From all of this
mass of matter it is evident that the
assistant chief of Johnson is a chip off
the same block, and has thoroughly
earned the disgust and dislike of every
clerk in the division. Especially are
the female clerks incensed against him,
and The Globe will not be at all as-
tonished to hear of a general revolt
against this individual by the female
clerks of the division, who indignantly

resent his harsh if not coarse and
brutal treatment. The favoritism shown
elsewhere in the Department is all the
more glaring when contrasted with the
harshness and severity to which the
clerks and employees in Johnson's divi-
sion are subjected. What Johnson or
Northcutt hopes to gain by this un-
manly treatment and domineering in-
solence over their fellow Government
employees is not clear, but at all events,
they are admonished that neither the
public welfare nor the good of the
service require any such discipline. It
is injurious to both and degrading to
the ladies and gentlemen whose neces-
sities compel them to submit.

MAXINE ELLIOTT

To Wear a Dress Made of Spun
Glass.

A VERY UNIQUE CREATION

There is but One Man in the World Who Can
Spin and Manufacture This Style of Dress—
and of Course He is An American—Full
Description of the New Toilet, which is Most
Economical.

There is only one man in the world
who manufactures a certain kind of
beautiful cloth. Out of that he has
just made a dress for Miss Maxine El-
liott, the actress, which is not merely
lovely and unique, but will wear for-
ever and a day. The man who manu-
factured the fairy fabric is H. Ham-
mesfahr, of Brooklyn, a modern magi-
cian, who spins and weaves weird ef-
fects out of a strange substance. The
material with which he works is glass.

Old used to think of drawing a
window pane into threads and wind-
ing them on a reel like cotton, the pro-
cess appears to be simple enough after
one has once seen it done. Holding
over a gas flame the end of a glass rod
about a foot long and half an inch in
diameter, Mr. Hammesfahr, in a minute
turns the rod in his hand. The glass
melts at the point, stringing off into a
fine thread. This is drawn out and
thrown on a huge revolving iron
wheel, which winds up the glass thread
as fast as it is spun. This wheel makes
350 revolutions in a minute, and winds
18 feet of thread with every revolution.
A mile and a half of glass thread
is thus spun in a minute. So fine is
the thread that it takes 350 of them
to equal the thickness of a cotton thread.
"I'll prove it to you," said Mr.
Hammesfahr, with enthusiasm, "I'll
spin for you a minute—sixty seconds—
this clock. Now, since this wheel re-
volves 350 times in a minute, there will
be 350 strands upon the wheel
after I've spun a minute. See that
bright stripe on the wheel. We'll take
it off and see if we can't spin it true."

Stopped at the wheel and cutting the
strands, Mr. Hammesfahr gathered
them up in his hand, pressing them to-
gether. The whole 350, it is true, did
not combine to make a thread any
coarser than the ordinary stout cotton.

These glass canes are woven for me
into a fine mesh, and yet it has the
look of cloth. The threads are woven
into cloth on that loom over there. It
takes about an hour and a half to
spin one of these rods into thread, and
each one makes about 100 miles of
thread."

The glass thread is finer and softer
than any wool or cotton or silk that
ever was spun. So fine is it that it
platts together easily and can only be
worked when wet. Neckties are made
of braided strands of glass fiber. There
are 60 strands in each necktie, and 1-
650 threads in each strand. It takes
three minutes to read your paper, but
in other words, the wheel revolves 1,050
times. Three hours' spinning will pro-
duce enough thread for one necktie.
They are braided by hand and the
woman who only knows how to plait
her hair in three strands must marvel
at the thread and the girls who
manipulate 60 strands into a regular
and pleasing pattern.

The dress made for Maxine Elliott
clothes a wax model of the actress,
which is a conspicuous feature of the
exhibit. Miss Elliott posed for the fig-
ure, and the dress was cut to fit her.
The cloth was made on a silk warp
with a glass filling. It has a wonder-
ful sheen similar to that of a moire
silk, but far more lustrous. It took a
week to make the cloth in the dress.
Everything about it is glass, even the
ribbons and the silver and gold used
edge the founces. When Miss Elliott
comes out on the stage in that gown,
every light in the theater will be re-
flected in it.

The strangest thing about it is its
wonderful softness. It is as pliant as
the finest man's velvet, and yet it has
a body to it that any other material
equally soft in its effects lacks. Fine
as the glass thread is, it is yet strong
enough to cut paper, as Mr. Hammes-
fahr illustrates when he is spinning,
by drawing a piece of paper through
the glass thread, and cutting it as clean
as with a knife.

The most charming thing about this
dress is its economy, apart from the
cost price. It is not merely tough
enough to last forever, but whenever
it gets soiled, a little sponging will
make it as fresh as ever. Soap and
are as good for it as for dirty windows.
In color it is an iridescent white. The
natural hue of the glass. The cloth
might have been made any shade, by
first coloring the glass.

Government Printing Office Items.
When Fred Powers goes to the Phil-
ippines, Tapley, the chief electrician,
will go in his place.
If the Public Printer will only send
Eddy McDonald and a few more of the
same ilk along with McFarland to
Manila, he will confer a great favor on
the employees, and materially improve
the moral atmosphere of the G. P. O.
The head of the street war-
house is temporarily suspended, owing
to the proprietor and a certain amor-
ous dame being absent on leave, and
it is sincerely hoped they will either
be cooled off or played out when they
return.

There are other families in the G.
P. O. that can make as good if not bet-
ter showing than the chief clerk's did
in the last issue of The Globe.
Public Printer Palmer is still absent
from the office, quite sick.
It seems that the G. P. O. has almost
more crosses than it can bear since the
roll-call.

The invincible head of the "Blaine
Invincibles" still works his pull with
the P. P.

Carolina Brights are mild and fragrant.

TANNER'S EFFORT

To Canonize Ex-Secretary Frank
Vanderlip.

A NOBLE EULOGISTIC EFFUSION

In Which The Globe Comes in for Several
Scientific Side Swipes—Nevertheless, we
are Pleased to Give the Writer Space and
a Fair Field, as He Has the Courage of His
Convictions and Signs His Name

EDITOR SUNDAY GLOBE:
The leader in The Globe called forth
by my defense of ex-Assistant Sec-
retary Vanderlip shows a very marked
difference of opinion.

Nothing is clearer to an experienced
jurist than the difference in the way
of looking at the same subject and giv-
ing an account of an occurrence by
different persons who saw it.

Vigorous, however, as your article
was in attacking Mr. Vanderlip, my ar-
gument in his favor was in no way dis-
proved. Anyone who knows anything
about the workings of our Depart-
ment knows full well that there are
many employes in it who endeavor
more steadfastly to do a maximum of
nothing than a minimum of something.
They enter Government employment
with a pull, and they depend upon that
pull to protect them from doing any
good.

When Mr. Vanderlip entered the
Treasury Department, the work in
many of the divisions was three years
behind. He knew there was ample
force in the division, where this state
of affairs existed, to do this work and
keep it up.

When many of the employees in these
divisions were called for they could
not be found at their desks, or even in
the building. They appeared for work
at any hour that suited their conveni-
ence and disappeared at their own
pleasure. The pleasure sure thing
about their being on hand at any given
time was on pay-day.

Mr. Vanderlip appeared promptly at
his work at 9 A. M. He was the
busiest man in the building from that
time until sometimes 12 o'clock at
night found him still at work. He con-
scientiously wanted the work of the
Treasury up to date everywhere in it,
and he conceived it to be his duty as
a sworn officer to have it brought up
and kept up. The task before him was
one that a timid man would never have
dared to undertake. The state of af-
fairs depicted above had existed for
years. Pandora had closed the lid of
his box, and there seemed no resort
but to let things go on in the same old
immature, slipshod way. It would
have been a miracle if Mr. Vanderlip
had allowed it to do so. But
every nerve and artery in his anatomy
protested against it. Duty to him was
a sun around which all planets revolv-
ed, and first trying gentle means, and
finding those of no effect, he found
that—

"Tender handed stroke a nettle,
And it stings you for your pains,
Grasp it like a man of mettle,
And it soft as silk remains."

and he found that grasping this "like
a man of mettle" was the only possible
thing to do to cure the incurable con-
dition he had before him.

This meant making many enemies.
It struck terror to the hearts of many
"moses" who had been indulged
in laziness and loafing the street for
years and years. Mr. Vanderlip did
have to put in time clocks in order to
try to do away with the existing state
of affairs. This the shirker and the
dodger, the loafer and the drawer of
pay looked upon as a state of affairs
place of tyranny and wrong. Now,
right here, Mr. Globe, does it not seem
clear to any working faculties that no
one who had a conscientious desire of
rendering to the Government that duty
they were paid to perform would ob-
ject to a time clock? The shirker and
the loafer, however, who are also
the simple recorded their presence in
the Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this
is too plain to be argued. It is plain
no reasonable employee could object to
this. But the editorial in The Globe
holds this thing up as a fearful wrong
to the employees. The shirker and the
loafer, however, who are also the
simple recorded their presence in the
Department? It seems to me this